

Appl. No. 09/584,676  
Atty. Docket No. 7897R  
Reply to Office Action of December 18, 2003  
Customer No. 27752

#### REMARKS

Claims 10-21 and 23-31 are pending in the present application, with claims 10-20 withdrawn. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Claims 21 and 23 have been amended to further define the invention. Support for the amendment is found throughout the specification and specifically on page 2, lines 18-21.

#### Drawings

Applicants are submitting corrected formal drawings showing a change to Fig. 9 and new copies of the photographs shown in Fig. 8. Applicants believe the formal drawings to be consistent with 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a) and M.P.E.P. §608.02(r).

#### Obviousness Double Patenting

The Examiner has rejected Claims 21 and 23-31 for obviousness-type double patenting over Claims 1-15 and 19-31 of co-pending Application No. 09/467,938; over Claims 1-7, 9-15, and 24-26 of co-pending Application No. 09/886,730; over Claims 1-7 of co-pending Application No. 09/886,740; over Claims 1 and 10 of co-pending Application No. 09/886,828; over Claims 1-10 of co-pending Application No. 09/886,829; over Claims 1-20 of co-pending Application No. 09/886,830; over Claims 1, 3-13, and 21-29 of co-pending Application No. 09/886,831; and over Claims 1-26 of co-pending Application No. 09/886,893. Pursuant to M.P.E.P. §1490, Applicants enclose an appropriate Terminal Disclaimer compliant with 35 U.S.C. §253 and 37 C.F.R. §3.73.

#### Rejection Under 35 USC 103

The Examiner has rejected Claims 21 and 23-31 under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Srinivasan, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,830,555) in view of Shimalla (U.S. Patent No. 4,588,630) and over Abuto, et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,804,021).

Applicants have amended the claims to more specifically define the invention. The claims have been amended to state that the laminate web has distinct regions being differentiated by at least one property selected from the group consisting of basis weight, fiber orientation, thickness, and density. Therefore, the web does not have the same properties throughout when viewed in the MD direction. Srinivasan et al, Shimalla, and Abuto et al. do not teach or disclose webs having distinct regions with different properties. Therefore, one having ordinary skill in the art would not have been motivated

Appl. No. 09/584,676  
Atty. Docket No. 7897R  
Reply to Office Action of December 18, 2003  
Customer No. 27752

by the disclosure of Srinivasan et al., Shimalla, and Abuto et al. to develop the present invention.

Conclusion

In light of the above remarks, it is requested that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw the rejections. Early and favorable action in the case is respectfully requested.

Applicants have made an earnest effort to place their application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as now claimed from the applied references. In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application, entry of the amendments presented herein, and allowance of Claims 21 and 23-31.

Respectfully submitted,  
John J. Curro, et al.

By Angela Marie Stone  
Angela Marie Stone  
Attorney for Applicants  
Registration No. 41,335  
(513) 634-9397

June 24, 2004  
Customer No. 27752